

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CANDACE SMITH,
Plaintiff,

v.

DYER, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No.: 1:24-cv-01288-JLT-EPG

ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION TO
PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

(ECF No. 2).

Plaintiff Candace Smith, proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint on October 22, 2024, along with an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (ECF Nos. 1, 2). Plaintiff has made the showing required by § 1915(a). Accordingly, Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 2) is granted.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 30, 2024

/s/ Eric P. Grogan
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The Court notes that, because Plaintiff proceeds *in forma pauperis*, Plaintiff's complaint is subject to screening before the Court authorizes the Clerk of the Court to issue summons. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915; see also *O'Neal v. Price*, 531 F.3d 1146, 1151 (9th Cir. 2008) ("After a prisoner applies for *in forma pauperis* status and lodges a complaint with the district court, the district court screens the complaint and determines whether it contains cognizable claims. If not, the district court must dismiss the complaint."); *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000) (noting that "section 1915(e) applies to all *in forma pauperis* complaints, not just those filed by prisoners"); *Preciado v. Salas*, No. 1:13-cv-0390-LJO-BAM, 2014 WL 127710, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2014) ("The Court is required to screen complaints brought by plaintiffs proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*"). Accordingly, the Court will screen Plaintiff's complaint in due course.